DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 443 CG 016 979

AUTHOR Roark, Mary L.
TITLE Work on the Campus: Benefits for Student and Institution.
PUB DATE 21 Mar 83
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Washington, DC, March 20-23, 1983).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Environment; College Role; College Students; *Employment Programs; Higher Education; Individual Development; Opinion Papers; *Part Time Employment; *School Community Relationship; School Counselors; School Holding Power; State of the Art Reviews; Student Attrition; *Student Employment; Student Personnel Services; Work Study Programs

ABSTRACT

Part-time campus employment benefits the student, not only financially, but by helping to clarify career goals, and by providing an opportunity to apply classroom learning to work settings. Students gain a sense of themselves as workers, coming to know their skills, interests and limitations. Job placement prospects, whether for temporary or post-degree positions, are enhanced by any work experience. Work also promotes developmental growth in college students in ways that are not available through academic and social experiences alone. Values, skills, emotional maturity, personal identity and integrity are fostered through employment experiences. The institution benefits from its student, cost-effective labor source by paying wages only for hours actually worked and by receiving high quality and productivity. A sense of community and uniformity of mission is increased by using student workers, thus increasing the student retention rate. To maximize student employment a centralized employment service, including public relations, record keeping, a "people bank," information system, and job development activities, should be established on campus. Counselors must enhance the value of work and design a linkage system between academics, campus work, and the community. Local economics, market needs, and community uniqueness must be analyzed so that students can learn to adapt and build their skills to fit future markets. (BL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235443

WORK ON THE CAMPUS: BENEFITS FOR STUDENT AND INSTITUTION

Dr. Mary L. Roark

Assistant Professor
Counseling Program
Plattsburgh State University College
Plattsburgh, New York

Presentation given at the American Personnel & Guidance Association Convention, Washington, D.C., March 21,1983

CG 016979

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary L. Roark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WORK ON THE CAMPUS: BENEFITS FOR STUDENT AND INSTITUTION

I. Introduction

Purpose
Theme
Definition

II. How work benefits the student

Monetary gain
Career exploration
Developmental growth

III. How work benefits the institution

Work accomplished at low cost
Sense of community
Retention

IV. Maximizing the values of campus employment

Centralized work programs office
Counselor strategies
Analysis of situational uniqueness

V. Summary

WORK ON THE CAMPUS: BENEFITS FOR STUDENT AND INSTITUTION

The purpose of this presentation is to identify how work on campus benefits both the students and the institution and, further, to identify means of making campus employment even more productive in the development of college students.

The theme of this presentation is that work is not a necessary evil--or if you prefer, not only a necessary evil--but that it is a chief means for achieving personal satisfaction, growth, survival, and quality of life. This surely is true for the college graduate, and it is true for the student still in college as well. Work has a double benefit-- the student and to the college.

My approach to this topic will be to identify the kinds of work experiences we are discussing. Then we will examine how work benefits the student, focusing primarily on student development. When we look next at how work benefits the institution, we will focus chiefly on retention considerations. After this background, the remainder of the paper will explore how to maximize the values of campus employment through a centralized work programs office, through counselor strategies, and through analysis of environmental and situational uniqueness.

When we speak of work for college students on campus, we mean any of a variety of forms of employment. The more common categories include: 1) federally-sponsored work study programs, where students work anywhere on campus where a legitimate work position has been established under the

appropriate guidelines.

2) on-campus employment from funding sources other than work study monies. Grants, temporary service contracts, and allocated institutional resources are the most common funding sources. These non-work study positions can be in a classroom or laboratories as assistants to professors; in other academic-related departemnts such as libraries and instructional media centers; or in the non-academic sector of campus such as residence units, food service, security, or maintenance.

3) on-campus private employment is a unique category where the work is on-campus but the funding mechanism is private. Individual typing services are an age-old example; work for the companies that contract work on campus is another example; this would most commonly include private food services, vending machine companies, and special marketing efforts.

This paper has as its focus that work which is done on campus by student workers. However, much of what follows is applicable as well to work off-campus. Internships and cooperative education experiences have most of the same benefits to the individual and sometimes even to the institution as the benefits we will describe; work off-campus also has similar values in some cases.

We are talking about employment <u>during</u> the school year. Some of the benefits, to the student at least, are also present in summer-time and vacation-time jobs.

HOW DOES WORK BENEFIT THE STUDENT?

Work contributes to the student in ways that are obvious and in ways that are less obvious. First of all, work provides income, and income

can provide necessities--like tuition money, board, room, books, and clothes--or luxuries, like more books, more clothes, entertainment, and toys (stereos, computers, cars).

Many students can continue their education only if they have the income that comes from work to supplement whatever other financial resources are available to them. Increasingly, as federal funds are cut back and family funds are tighter, employment is the most realistic avenue to being able to stay in college. As college costs continue to rise, the "student-as-worker" trend will also continue. Jobs bring college within the reach of those who otherwise might not be able to afford it.

Work can serve to help clarify career goals. It is almost as obvious a benefit as money is, to cite how parttime employment aids in the students' career growth. As a bridge between classroom learning and the world of work, ideal employment situations give the student an opportunity to apply classroom learning,and skills used in the work setting reinforce academic instruction (Warrington & Rivers, 1980).

Even when the situation is not ideal--when the student has not made a firm career commitment which can then be matched by a relevant work situation--work aids career growth in other ways. Students gain a sense of their work skills, interests, and limitations. They come to know themselves as workers. They obtain insight into the world of work. Their horizons can be expanded by exp osure to fields and opportunities they had not previously considered. They can test the reality of the choices they have made.

Job placement prospects are definitely enhanced for students with work experience. This is true even when the work was not particularly challenging, satisfying, or career-related. Work increases marketability by the

actual experiences of work, by adding a new dimension to the person (and hence, to their resume),beyond classroom experience, and by the development of job search skills.

The benefits of work to the individual student are not limited to monegained and to career considerations. Work is an activity that promotes developmental growth in college students. Student employment translates into student growth. There has been a historic link between work and education; between labor and learning. Work contributes to growth: intellectual, educational, personal, social, vocational and professional growth. Students learn the value of time, money, skills and relationships. They can develop self-esteem, responsibility, and clarification of values through work.

Laramee (1980) posits how values, skills, and new understandings can be developed in a work situation. In his framework, the learning overlaps: an individual can learn to understand about some facet of life and work; can learn the value of that part of life, and can learn the skill of the same. Take time management, for example. In a work setting, one can learn to understand time management, can learn to value time management, and can learn the skill of managing time.

Other examples of learning within work (Laramee, 1980) include understanding, valuing, and developing skills in the area of human relationships; human imperfections; problem solving; commitment and service; observation, analysis, interpretation, and expression of experiences; autonomy, self-knowledge, achievement, and tolerance.

As we consider employment as a means for developmental growth, we might want to look at the developmental models which apply to college students and take from them that learning which can be enhanced in the work

setting. There are a variety of such models, with different theorists using different language to discuss different aspects of development. Havighurst's (1951) developmental tasks, Erikson's (1959) life stages, and Levinson's (1978) life tasks all include the late adolescent, but each also goes before and beyond that typical college age group of 18-22. (Note that more and more of our students will fit later developmental stages as more and more adults enroll in colleges). R. Heath (1973) talks of "types;" D Heath (1968) of "self systems" and "growth dimensions;" Chickering (1969) of "vectors;" Perry (1971) of "positions" of intellectual and ethical development; Kenniston (1971) of "sectors;" and Kohlberg (1971) of "cognitive stages" or moral maturity. And, of course, there is the student personnel point of view, updated into the student development model, which responds to the whole person, attends to individual differences, and takes the student at whatever point of development he or she is at.

Chickering's (1969) vectors of development are the most useful of the developmental models for considering student growth via employment. Chickering uses the word "vector" to indicate both movement in a direction and magnitude of development; his vectors are themes or dimensions of development in the lives of students as they face the task of forming an identity. Chickering posits seven vectors of development, namely 1) developing competence, 2) managing emotions, 3) developing autonomy, 4) establishing identity, 5) freeing interpersonal relationships, 6) clarifying purpose, and 7) developing integrity. For Chickering, as for Erikson (1968), the identity issue is <u>the</u> central issue for the vast majority of students. Indeed, identity is defined through the other six vectors as :"that solid sense of self that assumes form as the developmental tasks for competency, emotions and autonomy are undertaken

with some success, and which, as it becomes more firm, provides a framework for interpersonal relationships, purposes, and integrity (Chickering, 1969), p. 30)."

Development in each of these seven vectors can be stimulated in a work environment;(indeed, to depend on a classroom environment alone or a classroom environment plus a residence environment would risk by-passing some potent learning situations). The vectors most obviously specific to a work setting are the first, developing competence; the third, developing autonomy, and the sixth, clarifying purpose.

Do students confirm that they grow from their jobs on campus? A study of 62 upperclassmen, of whom 75% held parttime jobs while in college, indicated the following personal gains from employment:

opportunity to meet a wide variety of people
development of personal responsibility
learning of new skills
increased ability to get along with people
development of self-confidence
satisfaction of helping someone; of doing a job
respect gained from others
development of assertive skills
helped me learn what I like to do
helped me learn what I don't like to do
learned to budget my time
learned of new professional fields
gained experience in mycareer field
overcame shyness

gained friends

boosted feelings of creativity

learned to "give and take"

showed me you have to work hard for what you want if you want to get anywhere (Roark, 1982).

Stone (1980) has a similar list entitled self-growth expereinced through internships; so does Laramee (1980) with his list of development gained by students from work experiences; Laramee translates his list into "learning objectives for work assignments as curricula components."

In summary, work is a developmental good for students. They begin to understand work as a process and themselves as a producer in that process; they begin to understand the relationship of work to a community and a society and themselves as a worker. They grow in ways that are not generally available through academic and social experiences alone.

Are there any negative effects of employment for the college student? Yes, there are. Work can be tedious, boring, and exhausinting for the student worker on campus as it is for any of us in other settings. The hours spent on the job can take time away from other activities and interefere with studying. In particular, work over 25 hours per week can be counterproductive to other goals of the typical student (Astin, 1975). The full-time worker, full-time student is a situation that is nearly impossible--except that we all know of personal examples of people who maintained both roles exceptionally well.

HOW DOES WORK BENEFIT THE INSTITUTION?

The actual work accomplished is one benefit to the institution. Employment of students provides a cost-effective labor source. Minimal fringe benefits for parttime workers is one cost-savings; flexibility in scheduling so that only the time periods of actual work needs are covered

by paid hours of work. In addition to cost considerations, student workers are compatible with campus clientele and productivity levels are high at routine tasks as well as at complex responsibilities.

A sense of community can be built and maintained by extensive use of student workers. This is a benefit to the institution as it seeks to carry out whatever the unique mission is that has been established for the college. It becomes a benefit for retention of students as well. At the same time, it can also be categorized as a benefit to the individual student.

A sense of community is valuable all-around. More than just the academic experience relates to the development of this community spirit. Jobs on campus are one means of building community as students interact with "significant others" beyond the classroom walls. Adults and fellow students are known as co-workers as well as classroom authorities and classmates. Familiarity with others on campus almost always breeds good rather than contempt; it creates a sense of belonging that can overcome other lacks of satisfaction. A positive work situation and positive reinforcement for a job well done helps students feel good about themselves and about their environment (McKenzie, 1981). Student and staff interaction are primary means for the development of a sense of community. As Noel (1975) stated, "A job can provide a meaningful kind of participation and a feeling of belonging, of involvement, a feeling of contribution, on the part of the student (p. 388)."

This sense of community (what Noel (1975) terms a "staying environment") leads directly into another major benefit of student employment to the institution--that of retention. Retention is a major concern for almost all

campuses as projected student popoulations decrease and as costs increase.

There are many complexities related to retention considerations. One of these is vocabulary: individual researchers use the same terms but do not necessarily define them in the same way. Common vocabulary includes: retention, attrition, holding patterns, persisters, attainers, withdrawal rate, graduation rate, dropouts, unnecessary dropouts, forceouts, and stopouts.

Another complexity of retention research is related to the basic question of why students leave. We know little about why students actually withdraw. Easy answers on withdrawal forms say little of real reasons for leaving school.

A third area of complexity in research on retention is that many variables affect whether a student decides to leave or to stay. There are multiple institutional and individual factors, as well as some factors external to both the individual and the institution . Many programs can affect retention by affecting the quality of life, academic and otherwise, on campus. Indeed, anything that takes place or fails to take place on a campus may affect the decision of a particular student as to whether to leave or stay.

Retention considerations center around institutional efforts to influence students to stay. While widely recognized that leaving a college of initial enrollment may actually be a positive action for an individual student, it is becoming more and more of an administrative necessity to keep students who were recruited into an intitution in ernollment at that institution. It is more cost effective to keep students than it is to recruit students.

Dropping out can have personal costs as a result of time lost, money and effort spent, damaged self-esteem, and disrupted personal plans. However,

social stigmas against dropping out of higher education, and even more particularly, of stopping out for a period of time, are minimal. As students become more consumer oriented about the cost effectiveness of a college program, it can be expected that they will leave even more readily than in the past if their expectations are not met.

Retention research increasingly is examining the interaction between stu-ent characteristics and environmental characteristics, particularly as this interaction serves to build a feeling of belonging and involvement on the part of the student. Tinto (1975) in his comprehensive review of retention research, reported that persistance in college is directly related to the degree of integration and harmony between the student and the environment. It follows that student employment increases this harmony and translates into student satisfaction. "Student employment is a potentially powerful tool in the continuing process of meeting students' changing educational and personal needs (McKenzie, 1981, p. 42)." Bazin and Brooks (1981) stated that "available research supports that the retention and success of students are linked to 'meaningful involvements' while in school. Work experiences rank as one of the most common and productive involvements for all college students (p. 8)." Among those who suggest increased on-campus, part-time employment as an institutional action to promote retention are Beal and Noel (1979), Lenning et. al (1980), and Ramist (1981).

Noel (1975) has stated elsehwere that "A student job can provide the kind of involvement and reinforcement that is so necessary to student satisfaction. The daily contact between some significant individual on that campus and the student can make the difference. Just reflect for a moment on the social/psychological needs of students--feelings of belonging, personal

worth, positive identity, high self-esteem. These are characteristics of a staying environment, and can be related to the student employment setting. It is not surprising to find that there is a relationship between student employment and student holding power (p. 393)."

Noel then added a cautionary note that "unfortunately, there are some campuses across this nation where student employment is contributing more to the holding power of students than are the faculty--a frightening observation (p. 385)."

Specific research studies relating student employment to retention have appeared in recent literature. The most extensive study was that by Alexander Astin (1975) reported in his book, Preventing Students from Dropping OUT. He surveyed over 40,000 students on factors related to college attrition. Among his findings were that parttime work (under 25 hours per week) faciltated student persistenace. In other words, having a job usually increased the students chances of finsihing college. In fact, work of a parttime nature was an improvement in terms of retention over no work at all, with dropout probabilities decreased by 10 to 15 percent. This positive impact of campus employment did not depend on the type of work, particularly whether or not it was related to academic studies. The degree of job satisfaction likewise had little effect on persistence.

Full-time work led to negative effects on retention in Astin's study, especially when the student was working full-time off campus.*

Factors which may have accounted for the positive effect on retention found by Astin were posited as 1) economic (security brought by the financial rewards of work) and 2) psychological (greater involvement with campus life).

*Other research that indicates fulltime employment and employment that conflicts with class schedules can lead students to drop out has been reported by Albina (1973); Martin (1975); Bucks County Community College,(1973); and Thurston and Brainard (1973).

R. Weiger (Noel, 1975) studied both persistors and dropouts at Nebraska Wesleyan University and from their responses, reported that 67% of those who stayed in school said that student employment was a significant factor in their ultimate persistance. Of all question asked, the largest difference in responses between persistors and dropouts was on the item of who held a parttime job (two persistors to every one dropout had been employed parttime while in college).

In another single-institution study on student attrition at Penn State, Everett (1979) concluded that parttime jobs on campus contribute to retention.

Inadequate parttime employment was included as one of the negative campus characteristics relating to attrition, as indicated by respondents from 947 institutions participating in the national survey reported by Beal and Noel (1979).

Noel tied together both the development of college students, of which we spoke earlier, and the retention of college students when he stated: "There is nothing margical about retaining students. Gimmicks or tricks of the trade will not work over an extended period of time. Students will tend to persist if the institution is deli-ering lively, exciting learning and growth experiences. Students want help in finding and devloping their talents. They want to sense that they are learning, that they are growing and fulfilling dreams, and that they are maturing intellectually and personally. Therefore, to an institution, retaining students means more and better teaching in the classrooms, more and better counseling in the counseling offices, more and better opportunities for students to participate in out-of-class activities. It means doing a better job of all the things that make up a campus. Helping students grow to completeness is what it is all about (Noel, 1978, p. 98)."

HOW CAN WE MAXIMIZE THE VALUES OF STUDENT EMPLOYMENT FOR AS MANY STUDENTS AS POSSIBLE?

To facilitate students' enry into a wide range of work experiences has values to the individual student and values to the institution. The task becomes one of expanding jobs on campus and making these work opportunities widely available.

When Nelson and Murphy (1980) attempted to identify how student services might change in the years immediately ahead due to budget and enrollment reductions, most of their study dealt with elimination and reduction of services. However, three of the ten new services proposed by the 72 student affairs administrators whom they polled related to the topics considered in this paper. Among these administrator's suggestions for new services to meet the needs of the future were the following: 1) establishment of an enrollment/retention task force; 2) increased use of student labor in student facilities, and 3) development and expansion of student employment services.

In the development of programs to better meet the needs of students seeking employment while enrolled in college, the most logical intervention is to establish a centralized employment service on campus. A full-service, one-stop employment service avoids the confusion of having similar functions located in separate offices on campus. Without centralization, a student may need to go to the financial aid office to determine eligibility for and location of work-study positions; to the placement office for help with job search skills; to the Cooperative Education, internship, or experiential education office to pursue avenues open through those channels; to the dozens

(or hundreds) of individual academic and support offices on campus to learn of openings available through grants, assistantships, or special institutional funds; to the private employers who have contracted on-campus work; to the local employment agencies in the community for advertised openings; and on and on.

This centralized office--perhaps named the student work office or the department of labor--could also serve needs not commonly met on campuses at the present time, such as help in finding summer jobs, establishment of a community job clearinghouse or exchange system, information on volunteer opportunities, and development of new jobs for students with local campus and community employers.

Among the values of a centralized work office to the campus employers are the promotion of consistency in application forms, in hiring procedures, in pay scales, in performance evaluation tools, and in grievance procedures. Counselors and personnen in this unified, coordinated approach to student employment also offer campus employers the service of pre-screening suitable candidates and even selection of workers, if desired.

Once the basic mechanisms are in place for serving the students' and employers' immediate needs for matching workers to available parttime jobs, personnel in the student work office could attend to other issues such as compiling accurate and uniform job descriptions, developing a compensation schedule based on a hierarchy of skill levels (Little & Chinn, undated), and monitoring potential effects of parttime employment earnings on the various forms of financial aid. A record keeping system could be devised for all work experience during a student's college career for use in placement portfolios or resumes for the post-graduation job search (Sokolowski & Dominy,

1981).

Another valuable activity for employment staff would be to provide information and education for students in workshop or written forms to meet any of a variety of needs related to work and money issues. Possible topics include interviewing skills, resume writing, job search technqiues, human relations on the job, how to make oneself valuable to an employer, budgeting, tax return preparation, appropriate styles of dress for different types of work, and so on. Personal counseling could be made available to those students who have difficulties becoming hired or staying employed.

Bazin and Brooks (1981) outline the steps to be taken in the development of a coordinated work experience program: 1) public relations campaign to attract listings from employers and inform students of the service, 2) designing an office and a record keeping system, 3) development of a "people bank" with individual names and employment needs/desires, in an easily retrievable format, 4) development of self-directed information system so that as soon as possible, for efficiency reasons, students could get the necessary information without one-to-one contact with counselors, and 5) undertaking of job development activity to find new sources of employment for students.

Staff responsible for student employment must keep in mind the developmental perspective and philosophy for student growth. Growth, as seen through a developmental perspective, is not simple maturation. Growth requires stimulation. The role of the environment, especially as viewed by Chickering (1969), is to provide challenges and stimulation, which in turn ecnourage new responses, which bring about developmental change (or growth). This perspective demands more of a student work office staff than the mere finding, filling,

and recording of job experiences.

Laramee (1980) stated that for work experiences to impact on values development and on personal growth, the work environment must provide for certain condtions, namely: 1) inquiry, dialogue, personal respect, and stimulation, 2) opportunities for students to accept responsibility for situations involving choices, first of minor consequence, then of major consequence, 3) students to take responsibility for their welfare and the welfare of others, and 4) students to deal with issues of stress and of increasing complexity.

A counselor intervention that enhances the value of work on a campus is to design a system to make the linkage between learning and work specific. The whole-institution approach to combining work and learning as known at Berea College in Kentucky (Laramee & Spears, 1978) is surely the epitome of this linkage on the college campus. Other systems, not based on such an all-encompassing system, would be to promote learning type objectives for work assignments; these objectives would be structured progressively much the same as curriculum is structured.

A design for debriefing (Laramee, 1977) or reflection upon learning (Little & Chinn, undated) about work is likewise valuable and fitting in a developmental framework. Learning from structured reflection on work activities can take place at a variety of points: at the time of placement, at the time of evaluation, or at the time of termination, or at any other point of counselor or supervisor intervention.

A few resources are currently available which are specific to staff needs and considerations for a job employment office. Little and Chinn (undated) have developed an on-campus employment program operation and

staff development manual with particular attention given to work supervisors, to the placement process, and to the analysis of jobs in terms of skill requirements. A job classification scheme has been developed by Adams and Stephens (1972). Warrington and Daly's article (1981) in the Journal of Student Financial Aid has much practical advice developed around a job locator program. See also Ford (1976) and James (1974) for ideas developed at Berea College.

Programs to enhance student employment on campus must be designed to meet changing needs specific to local economies and local campus situations. Hence, methods of analyzing local institutional and community uniqueness as related to student work are necessary. The dimensions and characteristics of one's own campus, community, and students may not seem particularly unique or special, but they do combine for an individual picture that is not a mirror of any other setting.

When conducting an assessment of the type of employment assistance that is best suited to a specific campus situation, the needs of several different groups are relevant. Among these are student needs, the needs of local campus employers, and perhaps an analysis of the community as it impacts on student employment.

Needs assessment can take the form of collecting answers to questions. What questions? What do you need to know? How many students are now working on campus parttime? How many others are actively seeking parttime work? How many others not now actively seeking work would be eager to work if they felt they could find a job that would fit their time/skills/needs? Where do the jobs now exist? What is the potential for developing more jobs? Are there people on campus who have work to be done? Under what conditions could they be persuaded to hire students to do this work? What problems need to be oversome?

Who needs to be convinced of the value of expanding student work programs?

Your questions are your starting point.

Warrington and Daly (1981) have a fine set of questions to be used in the assessment process. Their questions addressed thier institution's needs and characteristics as they explored development of a job locator program. Your own questions will serve your specific needs for information best.

Topical areas for Warrington and Daly's (1981) assessment revolved around the need for an expanded program, the local campus support, present job placement services,present career development services, organization structure, executive level administrative support, and funding sources.

The answers to your questions and where to find these answers will grow out of the phrasing of the questions. Some questions will need to be re-posed before they can be answered; other answers will remain partial; some answers will be clear-cut facts and others will be perceptions; perceptions do represent valid data and should not be ignored.

Seeking the answers to questions has a double value--not only do the questions get answered, but at the same time, discussion is stimulated among those people who have an interest in the outcome of an expanded on-campus work program.

In addition to answering questions, assessment of uniqueness and specific needs can take place in a descriptive fashion. Begin to describe--to profile--how things are on your campus. Set down in writing the facts and/or the impressions about your student body, your institution, your community and your viewpoint about the kind of employment program that would serve best.

Talk to those who have a vested interest in the program--because they will be funding it or because it will add to their burdens or it will ease their load or because they already are doing something along these lines. Nothing is really new, and many others on your campus already have opinions about the appropriate use of a student workforce to accomplish some of the work of the college.

In addition to developing your own questions and finding answers and in addition to writing descriptive profiles, needs assessment can also take place through the use of formal evaluation models, especially the context component of the Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model (Stufflebeam et. al, 1971). In that model, context evaluation is used for identification of group objectives, input evaluation is used for development of a plan for addressing objectives, process evaluation is used for monitoring program activities, and product evaluation is used to determine the extent to which objectives are achieved.

Needs assessment surveys can be designed for targeted groups, most obviously in the case of an employment program, the potential employers and the potential employees. Without question, one must have a well-formed impression about the need and design of a comprehensive employment program before moving to establish it.

SUMMARY

This paper has presented the point of view that parttime work for college students is of benefit both to the student and to the institution. It benefits the student by monetary gain, in career considerations, and for

developmental growth. It benefits the institution by the work accomplished at low cost, the sense of community that is built, and the possibility of increasing retention rates.

Increasing on-campus employment does not conflict in a major way with any other program on campus: it supplements financial aid, helps in admissions recruitment efforts, provides further involvement of students with faculty and other staff members, enhances career development, and provides labor that is needed by a college community. It can exist side by side with other programs, thereby adding to the quality of life on campus. And if this enhanced quality of life increases student retention, as it is most likely to do, that is a valuable happening; even if retention rates are not affected, improvement in the quality of life for the individual student and for the institution is a worthy outcome in its own right.

A campus by its variety and complexity of occupations constitutes an occupational education laboratory; it is a microcosm of the general work force with persons employed in hundreds of different tasks (Little & Chinn, undated). This laboratory of work life could well be used to greater advantage for all its components parts than is now the case.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

Where do you start on your campus to increase the number of students working, both for the value to the student and for the value to the college?

Who needs to be convinced?

What is the major impediment?

What do you need to know?

What needs to be done next?

REFERENCES

Adams, F. C. & Stephens, C. W. A student job classification plan for colleges and universities. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972.

Albino, J. E. Sex differences on factor dimensions related to withdrawing from college. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 19, 1973.

Astin, A. Preventing students from dropping out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Bazin, J. R. & Brooks, G. The work experience program--A collaborative effort between financial aids and the career planning and placement center. Journal of Student Financial Aid, 1981, 11, 5-8.

Beal, P. E. & Noel, L., What works in student retention. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1979.

Bucks County Community College. Follow-up study: Nonacademic attrition at Bucks County Community College, 1965-1972. Newton, Pennsylvania: Bucks County Community College, 1973.

Chickering, A. W. Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Erikson, E. Identity and the life cycle: Psychological issues. New York: International Universities Press, 1959.

Erikson, E. Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton, 1968.

Everett, C. L. An analysis of student attrition at Penn State. University Park, Pennsylvania: Office of Planning and Budget, Pennsylvania State University, August, 1979.

Ford, A. S. (Ed.). Directing the student work experience: A manual for supervisors. Berea, Kentucky: Berea College Press, 1976.

Havighurst, R. Developmental tasks and education. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1951.

Heath, D. Growing up in college: Liberal education and maturity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Heath, R. Form, flow and full-being--Response to White's paper. The Counseling Psychologist, 1973, 4, 56-63.

James, B. (Ed.). Work-study development project sourcebook no. 4. Berea, Kentucky: Berea College Press, 1974.

Kenniston, K. Youth and dissent. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.

Kohlberg, L. Stages of moral development. In C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, & E. V. Sullivan (Eds.). Moral education. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Laramee, W. A. Educational debriefing: A learning tool. Synergist, Winter 1977, 5, 30-35.

Laramee, W. A. Values clarification and self-understanding through student work related experiences. NASPA Journal, 1980, 17, 41-45.

Laramee, W. A. & Spears, P. Linking work and academic learning. Liberal Education, 1978, 64, 320-331.

Lenning, O. T., Beal, P.E. & Sauer, K. Retention and attrition: Evidence for action and research. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1980.

Levinson, D. The seasons of a man's life. New York: Knopf, 1978.

Little, T. C. & Chinn, N. On-campus student employment. Petersburg, Virginia: Virginia College Work-Study Program, undated.

Martin, F. H. A study of the "withdrawal sysndrome" at RSCC. Harriman, Tennessee: Roane State Community College, 1975.

McKenzie, D. Student employment and persistence. Journal of Student Financial Aid, 1981, 11, 38-42.

Nelson, J. & Murphy, H. The projected effects of enrollment and budget reductions on student personnel services. NASPA Journal, Spring 1980, 17, 2-10.

Noel, L. Work and the retention of college students. In Adams, F. C. et al. (Ed.). Work and the college student: Proceedings of the first annual convention on work and the college student. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975.

Noel, L. (Ed.). Reducing the dropout rate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

Ramist, L. College student attrition and retention. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1981.

Roark, M. Work experience of PSUC Upperclassmen. Unpublished manuscript, April 1982.

Sokolowski, S.M. & Dominy, L. J. The case for experiential education incorporating centralized coordinated student employment services. Plattsburgh, New York: Plattsburgh State University College Financial Aid Office unpublished manuscript, 1981.

Stone, E. L. Experiential learning: An idea whose time has come again. Journal of the NAWDAC, Winter 1982, 45, 22-26.

Thurston, A. J. & Brainard, S. R. Student attrition: The student personnel climate. In Student attrition: Strategies for action. R. L. Alfred (Ed.). Kansas City: Metropolitan Junior College District, October 1973.

Tinto, V. Dropouts from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. Review of Educational Research, 1975, 45, 89-125.

Warrington, D. L. & Daly, D. L. Job locator and development: A model program. Journal of Student Financial Aid, 1981, 11, 10-17.

Warrington, D. L. & Rivers, J. M. Part-time student employment: The benefits to students and employers. Journal of College Placement, Spring 1980, 37-39.